

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached replacement drawing sheet makes changes to Figs. 4A and 4B and replaces the original sheet with Figs. 4A and 4B.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-14 are amended. The drawings, the title and abstract are amended. No new matter is added. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiners Cheung and Nguyen at the interview held June 7, 2007, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

**I. Objection to the Specification**

The Office Action objects to the drawings for failing to include reference element C and reference element M (as referenced in the specification on page 22). To obviate the objections to the drawings, Figs. 4A and 4B are amended to recite elements C and M, as shown in the attached amended Figures. Specifically, the model soccer players labeled MPC in Figs. 4A and 4B are amended to recite NPC (character M) and NPC (character C), respectively.

The Office Action objects to the specification asserting that the title is not descriptive. To obviate the objection to the title, the title is amended as follows for clarity, "METHOD OF GAME CHARACTER MOVEMENT CONTROL IN GAME SPACE."

The Office Action objects to the Abstract asserting that it is not written in a grammatically correct narrative form. To obviate this objection, the Abstract is amended to be grammatically correct, as shown in the attached replacement Abstract.

The Office Action objects to the specification. To obviate this objection, the phrase "dominant athlete identification information 733d" is amended to recite "dominant team identification information 733e." Also, the phrase on page 40, line 26 is amended to recite

"space evaluation point." Applicant respectfully requests the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

## **II. Claim Objections**

The Office Action objects to claim 5 under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Accordingly, claim 5 is amended to recite "wherein movement target positions are set from recognized power areas to recognized non-power areas." Claim 4 is amended to recite "setting movement target positions within the recognized non-power areas."

The Office Action objects to the term "keeps" and the phrase "sample points" in lines 7 and 10 of claim 1. To obviate this objection, claim 1 is amended to recite "keep" and "plurality of sample points" respectively.

The Office Action objects to claim 2, lines 2-3 asserting that the phrase "on arrival times" should be amended to recite "on the arrival times." To obviate this objection, claim 2 is amended to recite "on the arrival times."

The Office Action objects to claim 4, line 6 asserting that the phrase "includes performing controlling for moving" should be amended to recite "includes performing controls for moving." Claim 4 is amended to recite "includes moving" to obviate this objection.

The Office Action objects to claim 7, line 2 asserting that the phrase "a compete type game" should be amended to recite "a competition-type game." Claim 7 is amended to recite "a competition type game" to obviate this objection.

The Office Action objects to claim 9, line 5 asserting that the phrase "the character group" should be amended to recite "the character groups." Claim 9 is amended to recite "the character groups" to obviate this objection.

The Office Action objects to claim 11, line 3 asserting that the phrase "the information making" should be amended to recite "the information makes." Claim 11 is amended to recite "the information makes," to obviate this objection.

The Office Action objects to claim 12, line 4 asserting that the phrase "the apparatus" should be amended to recite "the game apparatus." Claim 12 is amended to recite "the game apparatus," to obviate this objection.

The Office Action objects to claim 12, line 9 asserting that the term "keeps" should be amended to recite "keep." Claim 12 is amended to recite "keep" so as to obviate this objection.

The Office Action objects to claim 12, line 11 asserting that the phrase "the set sample points" should be amended to recite "the set plurality of sample points." Claim 12 is amended to recite "the set plurality of sample points" to obviate this objection.

In view of the above, withdrawal of the objections to the claims is respectfully requested.

### **III. Claim Rejections, 35 U.S.C. §101**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-11, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §101 asserting that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 1 is amended to recite an additional step of updating the image of the game space, to obviate this rejection.

The Office Action separately rejects claim 13 asserting that a carrier wave does not fall within the §101 statutory categories or the non-statutory categories specified by the Supreme Court. Accordingly, claim 13 is amended to recite a computer-executable storage medium that receives a data signal embodied in a carrier wave, comprising information used for executing the method as claimed in claim 1.

The Office Action separately rejects claim 14 asserting that a program claim without an associated physical medium or device, lacks practical application. Accordingly, claim 14 is amended to comply with 35 U.S.C. §101.

**IV. Claim Rejections, 35 U.S.C. §112**

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 6, 9, 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention.

The Office Action objects to the use of the word "respective" in line 6 and line 14 of claim 1. Claim 1 is amended to exclude the word "respective" in line 6 of claim 1 and to replace the phrase "the respective" with the phrase "each characters'," to obviate this rejection.

The Office Action asserts that the phrase "the characters on positions and/or magnitudes of the recognized areas in the game space" in claim 1 because it is unclear how the characters can be on positions or on magnitudes. To obviate the rejection, claim 1 is amended to recite "controlling the movements of the characters based on their positions and/or magnitudes of power in the recognized areas in the game space."

The Office Action rejects claim 2 asserting that the phrase "the set respective sampling" in lines 3-4 has insufficient antecedent basis. To obviate this rejection, claim 2 is amended to recite "the sample points."

The Office Action rejects claim 6 asserting that the phrase "the character group on the positions and/or magnitudes of the recognized areas in the game space" in lines 4-6 asserting that it is unclear how the character group can be on positions or on magnitudes. To obviate this rejection, claim 6 is amended to recite "selecting a character within a character group and controlling the character based on its positions and/or the magnitude of the recognized power areas in the game space."

The Office Action rejects claim 9 asserting that the phrase "pertaining to the power of each of the character group on the arrival times of the respective sampling points," asserting that the meaning of the limitation is unclear and that it is unclear as to whether the power of each of the character groups is recognized at a time of arrival to the sample points, or if the power of each of the character groups is recognized based on the arrival times. The Office Action also asserts that it is unclear what the "respective sample points" are respective to. Claim 10 is rejected by the Office Action on similar grounds. To obviate these rejections, claims 9 and 10 are amended to recite that the power of each of the character groups is based on the calculated times of each group to reach their respective sample points.

The Office Action rejects claim 12 asserting that the phrase "an arrival time calculation section for calculating arrival times of the characters up to the set sample points from the calculated positions as starting points" in lines 10-12 asserting that it is unclear what the starting points are, and whether the calculated arrival times are starting points, or the calculated positions are starting points. The Office Action also asserts that the phrase "the calculated arrival times of the characters up to the respective sample points" in lines 14-16 of claim 12 is unclear as to what the "respective sample points" are respective to. To obviate this rejection, claim 12 is amended to recite "an area recognition section for recognizing areas pertaining to power of the character group wherein the power of the character group is based on the calculated time of each character to reach the respective sample points."

In view of the above, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**V. Claim Rejections, 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-11 and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rupert (U.S. Patent No. 6,558,258); and rejects claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rupert as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Takatsuka (U.S. Patent No. 6,149,520). Applicant traverses these rejections.

Rupert and Takatsuka, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest recognizing areas pertaining to power of the character group wherein the power of the character group is based on the calculated time of each character to reach each characters' sample points.

Rupert at col. 6, lines 60-65, merely discloses that the analysis of player positions can be done using Voronoi diagrams. Such diagrams might be examined to identify a player closest to the ball and teammates and/or opponents that are the player's "nearest neighbors." At col. 4, lines 58-64, Rupert discloses that a field is divided into Voronoi cells and that the cells can be divided out by certain metrics. Rupert discloses that the distance metric is not always a uniform metric and could be a weighted and/or non-linear metric. However, Rupert does not mention that such metrics can be met to an individual character's power. Accordingly, Rupert fails to disclose or suggest recognizing areas pertaining to a power of the character group (in addition to an individual character) to the sample points.

With respect to independent claim 12, the Office Action cites to the secondary reference, Takatsuka. The rejection of claim 12 suffers from the same deficiencies of the rejection of claim 1. Takatsuka does not cure this deficiency. Specifically, Takatsuka, at figure 2, discloses a game apparatus for controlling a character in a video soccer game that tracks the position of a ball, opponents, and various players. However, Takatsuka also fails to disclose or suggest the section that recognizes areas related to power.

Thus, Rupert and Takatsuka, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest recognizing areas pertaining to power of the character group wherein the power of the character group is based on the calculated time of each character to reach each characters' sample points, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claim 12.

**VI. Conclusion**

In accordance with the above remarks, independent claims 1 and 12 define patentable subject matter. Claims 2-11, 13 and 14 depend from claim 1, and therefore, are also patentable for the same reasons, as well as for the additional features they recite. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-14 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



William P. Berridge  
Registration No. 30,024

Gang Luo  
Registration No. 50,559

WPB:EXC/mab

Attachments:

Replacement Drawing Sheet (Figs. 4A and 4B)  
Replacement Abstract

Date: June 7, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--